DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 939 HE 000 235

By-Harrington, Fred Harvey

The Compact for Education.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo.

Pub Date Nov 66

Note-18p.; Paper presented at 8th Annual College Self-Study Institute, University of California, Berkeley, July 11-14, 1966, "Campus and Capitol."

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00

Descriptors-*Coordination, *Educational Coordination, Higher Education, Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Interstate Programs

Identifiers-*Compact for Education

The Compact for Education is not yet particularly significant either for good or evil. Partly because of time and partly because of unreasonable expectations, the Compact is not yet a going concern. Enthusiasts have overestimated Compact possibilities and opponents have overestimated its dangers, so if the organization has limited rather than total success fears should decline. Although there has always been a strain between educators and elected officeholders, they have cooperated in many programs. The idea for the Compact was contained in James B. Conant's SHAPING EDUCATIONAL POLICY and foundation officials turned to Terry Sanford to carry forward the proposal. Sanford favored an organization that gave power to governors but that aspect was changed after legislators objected. Strong protests came from other sectors, notably higher education, concerning their lack of representation and concessions were made. It is necessary for the Compact to more further in the direction toward better understanding and cooperation among educators, public officials and citizens without undermining satisfactory relations already in existence. The Compact's success to date is to b e found in the mixing of these individuals. An annotated bibliography is included. (JS)

ED 026939

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Compact for Education

by
Fred Harvey Harrington
President
University of Wisconsin

Whether one likes it or not, higher education and government are forever tied together—more closely than ever before in American history. Since this is so, college and university administrators and elected officials, federal, state, and local, should get to know each other a little better for their own good and for the good of the republic.

This is a good starting point for a discussion of the Education Commission of the States, set up under the new Compact for Education. For if the compact has a contribution to make, it is basically in the field of the interrelationship between education and government.

The Compact: A Discussion of the Future

Note that I say "if." This is not meant to suggest doubt as to the value of the Education Commission of the States. Rather the intention is to suggest that any discussion of the compact must be primarily a discussion of the future. The organization is formally in existence; but it is not yet really off the ground.

This is a point that requires emphasis. Many think of the compact as already a going concern. After all, the organization meeting in Kansas City in 1965 did have before it a full compact document. Then came formal creation of the Education Commission

HE 000 235

of the States at a Chicago meeting in June 1966, with announcement that the compact had been officially approved by most of the states. Even before that, there was an announcement that the commission had an executive director, Wendell H. Pierce, superintendent of schools in Cincinnati. The delegates who gathered in Chicago chose permanent headquarters, Denver, and approved a batch of study topics proposed by the Interim Steering Committee.

All that sounds impressive. Impressive, too, are many of the strong statements that have been made about the venture. I have heard prominent public figures describe the compact as the great hope of the age, one of the most important developments of the twentieth century. I have heard other, equally prominent citizens, label it as one of the greatest threats to education in recent history.

As of this moment, both statements are rather doubtful. The compact is not as yet particularly important, either for good or for bad. It may be. It does have real promise of being useful, both to education and to state government. There is also a chance that it will damage existing institutions. But as of now the compact is not a major force.

The Fate of Great Expectations

What is the problem? Partly it is a matter of time and partly of expectations beyond the realm of likely results. The proper counsel now is to take the long view, and in doing so to be realistic about possible accomplishments.

To elaborate:

(1) It takes time to launch any organization. It takes a great deal of time to launch an organization designed to bring together elected officeholders, educators at all levels, and members of the general public. When fifty states are involved, and when formal ratification of an agreement is involved, the task assumes large proportions.

Take one angle only, legislative approval. By late summer 1966 thirty-seven—more than three-quarters—of the states had joined the compact. More than half, however, had done so by act of the governor. In nearly every case, approval by the legislature will be necessary for full participation, including payment of the state's

financial contribution to the commission. Generally, approval will be forthcoming, but it will take time. Biennial odd-numbered-year sessions are still the rule. Which is a way of saying that many states could not move to legislative endorsement from the time of the Kansas City meeting in 1965 until 1967.

Setting up a staff also involves time, especially in these days of heavy competition for high-level talent. The man who organized the compact, former Governor Terry Sanford of North Carolina, was not available to carry on after the launching. The Interim Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States was fortunate in securing the services of Ronald Moskowitz, a bright young Californian from Governor Brown's staff, to serve as associate director immediately after the Kansas City meeting. The search for an executive director moved along with reasonable speed, and in the spring of 1966 Wendell Pierce accepted the appointment. He could not, however, free himself from his responsibilities as school superintendent in Cincinnati until January 1967. The usual difficulties of securing the right sort of specialist assistants further complicated the time schedule.

None of this involved extraordinary delay. Rather, it is the normal story of a new office. But expectations for the compact were extremely high, largely because of the speed with which Governor Sanford had moved his program forward. There were some expressions of disappointment by the summer of 1966, especially in political circles ("What is happening?" "What are we going to get for our money?"). Chances are that there will be further comments of that sort before the Education Commission of the States can deliver much in the way of actual results. As progress becomes apparent, though, such statements should become less frequent.

(2) More important than the time schedule is the matter of realistic expectations. The language of the compact is very broad. It is so sweeping as to alarm many observers, a point on which I will comment later. Others have welcomed the strong phrases, seeing an opportunity to solve the problems of this generation. State officeholders and other citizens baffled by the complexity of educational needs are looking to this agency as one that can provide answers.

Perhaps it can—in time and in some measure. Unfortunately, many citizens are expecting too much. The compact may be able to do a great deal, but it probably cannot perform all the wonders.

Why? There are built-in limits. An educational commission of fifty states, with seven delegates from each, is large for efficient operation. Meetings will be infrequent, presumably once a year. Membership is bound to shift. It will be hard to arrange for a satisfactory exchange of views. It will be harder to reach significant agreement, with inexperienced delegates representing a wide range of views.

There will of course be a staff and a steering committee to get things ready for meetings of the commission. The steering committee, however, will be large (thirty-two members). Attendance promises to be a problem. With many different viewpoints represented and a shifting membership, progress may well be slow.

There is another limitation, money. The basic support of the education commission will come from state contributions. These will be large enough to support a substantial staff but not large enough to perform all the services that some expect. It should be possible to finance special studies with private foundation and federal government funds, but present budget guesses suggest a moderate-sized rather than a mammoth operation.

This is not said in criticism: The commission should be able to accomplish a good deal. Results are likely to be best if it does not try to do everything. It is important, however, to make those who hope for miracles realize that lesser achievements are worthwhile.

This may not be easy.

Enthusiasts have been over-estimating compact possibilities. Opponents have over-estimated the dangers. It may be, therefore, that if the education commission has limited rather than total success, fears and opposition will decline.

Which Directions Are the Right Ones?

The job now is to see that the organization does move, and in the right directions.

Which are those?

Toward better understanding and cooperation among educators, public officials, and citizens generally, without undermining satisfactory relations already in existence.

This point covers the whole of education, but I will confine my remarks to higher education.

Relations between government and higher education are anything but new. When we trace the history of the American university, we quote Thomas Jefferson, a politician, more than we quote any professional educator. We see that almost every one of the American contributions to education involves the closest relationship between government and campus: mass or universal education; the rise of research; the distinctively American phenomena of extension and public service, through which our higher education has carried learning beyond the classroom, library, and laboratory to the people.

As a land-grant institution, my own University of Wisconsin has depended on government funds for a century—has been supported by Congress and the state legislature for teaching, research, and public service.

Does this mean that we have been associated with politicians?

Of course we have. The territorial politicians started us, as part of the growth plan connected with the Wisconsin statehood movement. National political leaders, including President Abraham Lincoln, broadened us in the Civil War era by supporting agricultural and engineering studies. Before World War I their White House and congressional successors were enabling us to develop research and extension activities.

Soil and Seminar—Campus and Capitol

In turn we served the politicians by proving that their votes for education yielded good results. In my state the progressive era brought a new twist after 1900—the Wisconsin Idea, really a partnership of Campus and Capitol (soil and seminar, we called it, to show the tie of the university to the people). Professors went on loan to state government, served on state commissions, supplied ideas for social and economic legislation, and trained state officials.

Nor was that the end. World War I brought the beginnings of the same sort of partnership between the federal government and American universities. This was greatly expanded in and after World War II, especially in research. It became commonplace for professors to take leave and work for the federal government. Lately we have seen a sharp increase in university-Washington cooperation on problem-solving and action programs (poverty, community service, the Peace Corps, technical services to industry, to name a few). Meantime, there are new teaching-research-service partnerships between our campuses and foreign governments. And professors are working more closely with American city governments.

Inevitably this has brought professional educators into closer touch with elected officials. There has been some of this for a long time. The difference now is one of size and complexity. The operation is getting bigger, more expensive, more complicated. So we must work harder for understanding and cooperation.

Take the federal government. Washington support for higher education, formerly rather small, now exceeds two billion dollars a year. What is more, the federal higher education effort is increasingly broad. Not long ago it centered largely on research. Now there is a heavy involvement in teaching and service programs. Both public and private colleges and universities are affected. The total is not enormous by defense expenditure standards, but it is large enough to make national executive and legislative leaders very education-minded. And, since the two billions is a fifth of the nation's total higher education budget, college and university administrators realize that they must spend more and more time in Washington. A decade ago some of these administrators could not even name their congressmen. Now they can call them by their first names.

Although federal government developments get most of the news space, the state legislatures continue to provide more higher education money than does Congress. With the enrollment boom of the present generation, colleges and universities have desperately needed funds. Their spokesmen have had to appeal time and again to governors and legislators and to the general public. They ask for more and more money for existing institutions, more and more

for new campuses, more and more for professional and graduate work.

The State and the Educator: Mutual Distrust?

Meanwhile governors and state legislatures have been caught in a tax squeeze. With the federal government absorbing most of the tax dollar, not enough is left for the states, just when they need maximum amounts for highways, for health and welfare, as well as for education. Constituents have resisted tax increases—and at the same time have demanded more educational opportunities. Caught between these conflicting pressures, legislators and governors have generally provided the needed appropriations. At the same time, they have come to examine institutional requests much more closely than before. They have hired budget analysts for this; they have set up all sorts of coordinating boards to make sure that the educational dollar is spent wisely.

There has always been strain in the relationship between educators and elected officeholders. The strain has increased in recent years. Some politicians have made a specialty of attacking higher education as unnecessarily expensive, as arrogant and unresponsive to public opinion, even as immoral and disloyal. In turn, some educators have denounced politicians as lacking in understanding, devoted to mediocrity rather than high quality, and determined to strip the institutions of higher education of their autonomy in matters large and small.

Fortunately, these judgments are not universal. Most college and university administrators realize that political leaders want to provide the best educational services possible. Most officeholders are proud of the institutions in their districts and like to think of themselves as supporters of education. Educators whom I meet are forever boasting of the backing they receive from their political representatives. Officeholders whom I meet are forever boasting of the high quality of the colleges and universities in their districts.

Obviously, then, there is a great deal on which to build; the building has already begun. Regional organizations like WICHE have brought educators and officeholders together, and the results have been excellent. City, state, and federal government officials increasingly rely on university advice and cooperation. Universities work more closely than ever before with every sort of gov-

ernment agency. This has become easier as legislative and executive departments have built up competent full-time staffs.

But there is much more to do. Misunderstandings are numerous. Suspicion remains. Along with cooperation there are charges of interference. Many public officials feel that they should have more control over higher education. Many university trustees and administrators fear that their institutions are losing their autonomy, that elected officials are making all the basic decisions.

How does the Compact for Education fit in here? To some it seems to point to an increase in political interference in educational matters. To others (and I include myself) it offers promise of improved relationships between educators and elected officeholders.

Conant: The Birth of an Idea

The story begins with James B. Conant's *Shaping Educational Policy*, published by McGraw-Hill Book Company in 1964. Conant found education in "disarray." He traced much of the trouble to local control of the schools and to competition for state legislative appropriations among the public colleges and universities. He felt that strengthening state departments of education could help some at the school level (as in New York). In higher education he found hope in coordinating committees and master plans (as in California). But more was needed if Americans were to wrestle effectively with junior college and vocational questions, with the problem of the underprivileged, with the need for uniformity in requirements for the Ph.D.

Since the national government does not control education, Conant maintained that there was need for cooperation between state officials and educational leaders across state lines. This was necessary, he said, to correct the "haphazard interaction" between these groups, to bring "some degree of order" into educational decisions. Why not a formal interstate compact for educational policy, he asked; why not work toward a "nationwide" policy in this field? Regional agreements had been successful. Why not try for more?

Shaping Educational Policy did not sell as well as Conant's famous *American High School Today*. Nor did it receive as much critical acclaim as had been showered on his *Slums and Suburbs*. Many educators disagreed with some or all of Conant's conclusions. There were those who felt that Conant should have given more

attention to the advantages of diversity. Others feared that the compact proposal, if carried forward, would destroy or weaken useful relationships between politicians and school people built up through the years. One professor, M. M. Chambers, wrote a book-length answer to every point in the Conant study.

Shaping Educational Policy did, however, have many defenders; and, since it led to action, it is an important volume. It is worth reading for that reason alone—and for its many interesting suggestions. In my own re-reading I was struck by Conant's emphasis on the need for educators and elected officials to get together, to understand each other, to work together when at all possible.

Busy with many things, Conant did not intend to organize the interstate agreement proposed in *Shaping Educational Policy*. It was the Carnegie Corporation which took the next step. This foundation has supported all the Conant educational studies and has, of course, been interested in moving from study conclusions into action.

Sanford: The Birth of Reality

In this case Carnegie officials turned to Terry Sanford, North Carolina's "education governor," to carry forward the compact idea. The Carnegie and Danforth foundations provided the financing.

In the history of the formation of the compact, Sanford is as important as Conant. The proposal as contained in *Shaping Educational Policy* is very general. Sanford gave it shape. He did so in a remarkably short time, which is a tribute to his great ability, his drive, and his powers of persuasion.

When *Shaping Educational Policy* came out, John Gardner headed the Carnegie Corporation. Soon thereafter, as the compact began to take form, Gardner went to Washington as President Lyndon B. Johnson's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This led some to fear that the compact was really designed to secure general acceptance of federal education policies. Actually, it was nothing of the kind. Sanford is an enthusiastic believer in the importance of state action. When he took on the compact problem he was already involved in a Ford Foundation project on the role of the states. He and those who worked with him in

1965 seem to have hoped that the compact would result in interstate cooperation to make more effective use of state resources and also influence the direction of federal government activity in the education field.

Like Conant, Sanford believed in building bridges between educators and elected public officials. As governor of North Carolina he had seen these two groups working together harmoniously on projects of the Southern Regional Education Board. He was convinced that the same approach would work on a national scale.

Just how should this closer cooperation be arranged? Since the Conant book gave few clues as to how it should be done, the choice was left to Sanford. As a former state chief executive, he naturally inclined toward a structure that gave a prominent position to his old colleagues. Under the compact as he brought it forward, governors automatically belong to their state delegations at meetings of the Education Commission of the States, and most of the other delegates serve at the governor's pleasure. It developed that the Education Commission of the States would always be headed by a governor, and the state chief executives were guaranteed a strong position on the steering committee. At Sanford's urging, governors were out in front in support of the compact before its formal adoption; their leadership was apparent at the organization meeting in Kansas City in 1965.

There was certainly good reason for working with the governors. By doing so—and getting early backing from the Governors' Conference—Sanford was able to move the compact along much more rapidly than would otherwise have been possible. It is clear, too, that no interstate compact would have been possible without strong support from the governors. Besides, governors have a central role in educational planning. Nearly every one of them puts education at the top of his list of problems. Was it not right that they should have the key position?

Perhaps, but there were voices of concern.

Crisis: Who is to Lead?

Some concern was voiced by other elected officeholders. In one state the legislature refused to accept the compact after the governor had endorsed it. In others legislators grumbled that the governors

had been given too much power in the new organization. To be sure, the compact provided that both houses of the legislatures would be represented on the state delegations at the annual meetings of the Education Commission of the States. But there was no formal assurance that the state legislative voice would be as strong as that of the governors on the steering committee, where many decisions would be made. The battle was clearly joined in California and other states, and national state legislative spokesmen like Unruh of California and McCarty of Oklahoma made their views known.

What to do? For legal and other reasons those who had drawn up the compact had vigorously opposed amending the original language. Every one could see, though, that legislative consent was necessary. To be sure, the compact was to go into effect when ten states had joined. Obviously, however, more were needed—for effective cooperation and because the states were to pay the bills after the initial (foundation-support) period.

In consequence, the compact was changed. The size of the steering committee was increased to thirty-two. Legislators were guaranteed representation equal to that of the governors (eight each, the remaining half being reserved for educators and other citizens).

Crisis: Should Higher Education Follow?

More and stronger protests came from other sectors, notably from higher education. The higher education complaints were not all owing to the place of the governors in the compact. Some were directed at the speed of organization. Sanford had been in touch with a number of educational associations before the Kansas City meeting and he had called some meetings for comment and discussion. Most college and university presidents, though, were caught by surprise when the compact was brought forward. Many felt that the new organization did not give enough consideration to the existence of regional organizations. Others said that the compact was not really needed (were there not enough organizations, enough meetings, enough studies already?). And there were comments on the absence of faculty voices in affairs of the Compact for Education.

Most important was the matter of representation. Since the governors controlled the makeup of the state delegations to the education commission, there was no assurance that the several segments of higher education would be represented in decisions and recommendations (this concerned private as well as public institutions). Presidents of state universities were of course accustomed to dealing with their governors and legislatures and coordinating committees. They were worried, however, about the possibility that the seven-man state delegations to the Education Commission of the States might become additional "state educational councils" back home, adding one more policy or review group to those already in existence.

Higher education opposition mounted after the Kansas City meeting. It was especially strong in the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. This group proposed that higher education be omitted from the compact; or, that failing, that the Education Commission of the States establish a special advisory committee for higher education.

Concerned, the Interim Steering Committee of the compact gave a good deal of attention to higher education attitudes in 1965-66. There was spirited debate at the New York and Santa Fe meetings of the Interim Steering Committee, with some sharp criticism and some strong defense of the views of college and university spokesmen. Higher education was not dropped out of the compact. But concessions were made:

(1) It was agreed that the seven-man state delegations to the Education Commission of the States would be just that, and would not function as educational councils back home.

(2) The Interim Steering Committee agreed that there would be a special Higher Education Advisory Committee, to be nominated by the American Council on Education. This advisory committee was set up in the summer of 1966 and first met in September. It chose as its chairman President Elvis Stahr of Indiana University. Stahr had strongly opposed the compact. But, now that it was in existence, he was willing to work with the Interim Steering Committee in the interests of higher education. A number of his colleagues shared his attitude.

Precis

The Compact for Education

The intention is to suggest that any discussion of the Compact for Education must be primarily a discussion of the future. The organization is formally in existence, but it is not yet really off the ground. What is the problem? Partly it is a matter of time and partly of expectations beyond the realm of likely results. The job now is to see that the organization does move, and in the right directions.

The story of the compact begins with James B. Conant's Shaping Educational Policy, **published in 1964. He found education in a state of disarray. He traced much of the trouble to local control of the schools and to competition for state legislative appropriations among the public colleges and universities. Why not, he asked, work toward a nation-wide policy in this field? Regional agreements had been successful, why not try for more?**

In the history of the formation of the compact, Terry Sanford is as important as Conant. The proposal as contained in Shaping Educational Policy **is very general. Sanford gave it shape. He did so in remarkably short time.**

Sanford naturally inclined toward an organization giving prominent position to governors; there was certainly good reason for this. By doing so he was able to move the compact along much more rapidly than would have been otherwise possible. But there were voices of concern. Legislators grumbled that the governors had been given too much power in the new organization. In consequence the compact was changed.

More and stronger protests came from other sectors, notably from higher education. There was no assurance that the several segments of higher education would be represented in decisions and recommendations (this concerned private as well as public institutions). Higher education was not dropped out of the compact, but concessions were made.

Most of these topics touch on the basic theme of this WICHE conference, the relationship between educators and public officials. And in this same area one finds the main success of the compact to date.

Precis

The Compact for Education

The intention is to suggest that any discussion of the Compact for Education must be primarily a discussion of the future. The organization is formally in existence, but it is not yet really off the ground. What is the problem? Partly it is a matter of time and partly of expectations beyond the realm of likely results. The job now is to see that the organization does move, and in the right directions.

The story of the compact begins with James B. Conant's Shaping Educational Policy, **published in 1964. He found education in a state of disarray. He traced much of the trouble to local control of the schools and to competition for state legislative appropriations among the public colleges and universities. Why not, he asked, work toward a nation-wide policy in this field? Regional agreements had been successful, why not try for more?**

In the history of the formation of the compact, Terry Sanford is as important as Conant. The proposal as contained in Shaping Educational Policy **is very general. Sanford gave it shape. He did so in remarkably short time.**

Sanford naturally inclined toward an organization giving prominent position to governors; there was certainly good reason for this. By doing so he was able to move the compact along much more rapidly than would have been otherwise possible. But there were voices of concern. Legislators grumbled that the governors had been given too much power in the new organization. In consequence the compact was changed.

More and stronger protests came from other sectors, notably from higher education. There was no assurance that the several segments of higher education would be represented in decisions and recommendations (this concerned private as well as public institutions). Higher education was not dropped out of the compact, but concessions were made.

Most of these topics touch on the basic theme of this WICHE conference, the relationship between educators and public officials. And in this same area one finds the main success of the compact to date.

Section VI

The Compact for Education

Allen, James. "The Compact: New Strength for the States," *Educational Record,* Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter, 1966), pp. 113-115.

"The Compact for Education, one of the most exciting innovations in this interesting period in American education, offers a valuable opportunity for strengthening the states and for developing a productive relationship among the three levels of government in solving the problems of education. It is important that the specific purpose of the compact be clearly understood . . . it would be foolish to assert that such a far-reaching development is without its risks. . . ."

Berg, Rodney, "The Compact and the Junior College," *Junior College Journal,* Vol. 36, No. 8 (May, 1966), pp. 8-9.

As president of a junior college and member of the steering committee of the compact, Mr. Berg sees as significant the fact that a study of junior college development and expansion has high priority in the compact. The compact, with its proposed network of information exchange, is seen as playing a potentially powerful role in solving some of the emerging junior college problems.

Cartter, Allan M. "The Shaping of the Compact for Education," *Educational Record,* Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter, 1966), pp. 81-98.

The author traces the development of the Compact for Education from the introduction of the concept in Dr. Conant's *Shaping Educational Policy,* in 1964, through the early part of 1966. He concludes his remarks with a general assessment of the new organization.

Chafee, John H. "The Compact on Education is a Reality," *Junior College Journal,* Vol. 36, No. 8 (May, 1966), pp. 6-9.

Chaffee, as chairman of the new Compact for Education, summarizes the highlights of the causes which brought the compact into being, and some of the results he hopes it will achieve. He emphasizes that the compact will be a happy medium between the independent educational views of the states, and the influence of the federal government. By playing a coordinating role rather than policy-making, it will help the states coordinate their educational efforts, and help the federal government be more sensitive to the educational needs of the states.

Chambers, M. M. *Freedom and Repression in Higher Education.* Bloomington, Indiana: The Bloomcraft Press, Inc., 1965. 126 pp.

In the author's words, he has "struggled to explain and present favorably the principle of individual freedom of choice and of institutional autonomy in higher education . . ." which to him are more important than centralized planning and administrative bureaucracy. Dr. Conant's book, *Shaping Educational Policy,* is heavily criticized on the grounds that Chambers feels diversity rather than unity ". . . is needed in a state's higher education policy, and at all costs our systems of higher education should steer away from any uniformity or regimentation of a bureaucratic nature."

Cohodes, Aaron. "Compact for Education Slated for December Start: Sanford," *Nation's Schools,* Vol. 76, No. 5 (November, 1965), pp. 55-56.

A summary of the Kansas City conference on the proposed Compact for Education. It deals primarily with the views expressed by some of the 19 governors, 50 state legislators, and 250 educators who attended.

"Compact for Education," *Educational Record,* Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter, 1966), pp. 116-121.

A reprint of the preamble and articles of the Compact for Education.

Conant, James B. "How the Compact can Assist Universities," *Educational Record,* Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter, 1966), pp. 99-105.

"The newly created organization can help the private and public colleges and universities of the nation. . . . One thing seems certain—what happens will depend on the attitude of the leaders of education at all levels."

———. *Shaping Educational Policy.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964. 135 pp.

Major concern is directed toward the recent trend of American higher education to turn to the federal government for advice and leadership. Conant feels that real bedrocks of higher education must be our state legislatures and trustees of private colleges and universities. Up to the present, however, few states have really effectively played a policy-determining role with the real objectives of the institution in mind. California and New York are cited as excellent examples of states which have adopted a system of a master plan in order to effectively plan and coordinate their systems of higher education.

Leach, Richard H. and Redding S. Sugg, Jr. *The Administration of Interstate Compacts.* Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1959. 243 pp.

This work gives a detailed explanation of the Interstate Compact—its development, operation, and function. This rather new creature in public administration arose out of the concern for those areas of government which fall by default to the federal government if not occupied by the states. By remaining problem-oriented and through effective cooperation on a regional level, these agencies have made significant contributions in such areas as education, natural resources, and specific public problems.

Levine, Daniel U. "The States Run Scared," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 47, No. 3, (November, 1965), pp. 134-135.

This article reports on the Kansas City planning conference to implement the State Compact for Education. The tone of the conference was both positive and optimistic toward the compact, which will provide machinery to collect and interpret information, develop proposals for educational financing, etc. The tone was so positive, in fact, that the assembly voted to create a steering committee, to employ staff, select headquarters, and work with the individual states in establishing an Educational Commission of the States.

Longenecker, Herbert E. "Some Implications of the Educational Compact Proposal for Higher Education," *Educational Record*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter, 1966), pp. 106-112.

"Given the present situation and the widespread apprehension and outright dissent almost unanimously expressed by those in higher education who have carefully and thoughtfully examined the implications of the proposed compact, one course of prompt action now seems relevant: states not yet aligned with the compact should be discouraged from joining it."

Orentlicher, Herman T. "The Compact for Education," *AAUP Bulletin*, Vol. 51, No. 5 (December, 1965), pp. 437-446.

A critique on the September 29-30, 1965 conference held for the planning of the Compact for Education in Kansas City, Missouri. The article explains that under the established compact, an "Educational Commission of the States" will be formed to represent a powerful force in the development and effectuation of policy in all areas and aspects of education in this country. The compact itself, plus a summary of it and other related materials prepared by its drafters, is also included.

"School Men Tie Strings to Their Support of Compact," *Nation's Schools*, Vol. 77, No. 1 (January, 1966), p. 67.

Report on an opinion poll concerning the Compact for Education proposed by Dr. James Conant. The compact, which will provide information on educational policy-making, met with 82 percent approval of schoolmen polled, and 16 percent disapproved on grounds that the compact will lend itself to possible bureaucracy.

Spinning, James M. "Has Conant Created an Establishment of One?," *Nation's Schools*, Vol. 75 (January, 1965), pp. 28+.

An article outlining James B. Conant's proposal for a national policy in education. He calls on educators to (1) discredit the accreditation associations for teacher education and certification; (2) to examine our educational needs and performance state by state, through lay committees dedicated to facts; (3) to restructure and strengthen our state education departments; (4) to create voluntary collaboration of the states on "Interstate Commission for Planning a National Educational Policy."

Wayson, W. W. "The Political Revolution in Education, 1965," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. XLVII, No. 7 (March, 1966), pp. 333-339.

The author says that educators should encourage and engage in more and more investigations of our educational policy processes. First, to understand and perhaps direct emerging changes in local, state, and federal roles; second, to develop systematic knowledge about the politics of education upon which to base a training program for future educational statement. The Compact for Education is cited.

Wynn, Richard. "An Inept Lesson in Educational Policy Making," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. XLVII, No. 6 (February, 1966), pp. 251-256.

This is an analysis of Conant's book, *Shaping Educational Policy*. Mr. Wynn suggests that the book is an oversimplified and astonishingly erroneous description of the interaction of governmental and voluntary associations in a few states. His primary quarrel is related to Conant's proposed policy-making at the state level of government.